

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The amendments to claims 1, 11, and 32 are clearly supported by the specification, for example at pages 1-4 thereof. See in particular the last nine lines of page 1; the bridging paragraph between pages 2 and 3, and the bridging paragraph of pages 3 and 4.

In discussing the requirement for restriction, on page 2 of the Office Action the examiner states: "While the previous examiner searched the case, the current examiner does not have access to that search." This statement is not understood. It is assumed that the examiner has access to the prior art of record in this application: eight references as returned by the examiner in the Office Action of February 13, 2003. If any assistance is required, please let us know.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-10 and 32-36 as unpatentable over Luciano et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,641,483, in view of Graham U.S. Patent No. 5,093,861.

Turning to amended claim 1, while Luciano does teach an access control system, Luciano fails to disclose the concept as expressed in claim 1 of this invention and in the portions of the specification previously cited, namely "...said storage media storing personnel identification data that authorizes access by certain, identified personnel to some, but not all, of said plurality of physical areas."

By this invention, the apparatus is capable of providing differing opening results among the multiple lock mechanisms to different personnel, depending upon their particular identity. As described on page 1 of the specification, different persons may need access to different parts of the machine or machines, depending on the nature of

their jobs. Some of the people are not to have access to other parts of the container such as the money container or the like. On the other hand, a money collecting person may have access to the money container, but it may be desired for him to not have access to other critical functional areas of the machine, to reduce the opportunity for tampering. By this invention, each individual employee with access to at least one part of the machine will automatically be granted just the limited access to the machine that is intended, and not more.

It should be noted that such a claim does not exclude the existence of personnel identification that authorizes complete, unlimited access by certain identified personnel, although that is not specifically claimed in claim 1. An embodiment of this invention may include that feature.

Turning to Luciano et al. and Graham, it is not seen that these claimed distinctions as described above are present in the disclosure of the two references cited in the rejection, nor is it seen why such features of claim 1 would be deemed to be obvious.

In view of the above, allowance of claim 1, and its dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

Turning to the rejected method claim 32, the distinctions of this claim over the combination of Luciano et al. and Graham is submitted to be the same as the distinctions of claim 1 over that prior art. Note in the amended claim 32, the similar distinction that access by certain, identified personnel is authorized to some, but not all of the plural locked areas. As stated above, it is believed that this selective,

individualized, incomplete access by certain, identified personnel is a concept not taught in the prior art of the examiner's rejection.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 32 and its dependent claims 33-36 are also patentable.

In view of the above, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP



Garrettson Ellis
Registration No. 22,792
Attorney for Applicant

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 269-8567